



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,958	10/31/2003	Udo Klein	16104-013001 / 2003P00608	8797
32864	7590	06/14/2007	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			WEI, ZHENG	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2192		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/14/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/698,958	KLEIN, UDO
	Examiner Zheng Wei	Art Unit 2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Remarks***

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 03/30/2007.
2. Claims 1-3, 11, 14, 16 and 19-23 have been amended.
3. The 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejection of claims 11-13, 19 and 22 are withdrawn in view of the Applicant's amendment.
4. The objection to the drawings filed on 12/23/2004 is withdrawn in view of Applicant's replacement drawings filed on 03/30/2007.
5. Claims 1-23 remain pending and have been examined.

### ***Response to Amendment***

6. Applicant's amendment filed on 03/30/2007, changes the scope of claims 1-23. Therefore, a new ground of rejection is applied.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/30/2007, in particular on page 9, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. For example:
  - At page 9, last paragraph , the Applicant contends that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Baber, as there is no need for Baber to detect the presentation of the messages or to store the presentation in a log, and Baber also does not

disclose or suggest the detection and the storing a log, which the Examiner disagrees. As to previous Office Action, page number 4, examiner pointed out in Baber's disclosure at Fig 4., item 420, Fig 6, step 600 and also refers back to Fig.3D about Queuing Mechanism 360. The Queuing Mechanism must detect the incoming message in order to send out "Queue notification" as item 304 showed and further stores the notification in the queue.

Therefore, the Applicant's argument is moot and not persuasive.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:  
A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-3, 7-10, 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Baber (Baber et al., US 6,658,485 B1)

Claim 1:

Baber discloses a method of gathering information about a user message, the method comprising:

- detecting that a program presents a user message to a user in a computer system where the program is being executed (see for example, Fig.4, step 420, Fig.6, step 600 and related text, "Extract item identifier from message");
- recording, in response to the detection, a user message identifier of the user message (see for example, Fig.6, step 620, "Generate 'notification' with item identifier, priority, file name, percent complete", step 630, "Put notification into Notification Queue in the 'right' place depending on priority" and related text); and
- using the recorded user message identifier in storing information that documents the presented user message in a log that is accessible to a user of the computer system (see for example, Fig.6, step 620 and related text, also see, col.14, lines 14-19, "Block 620 generates the information to be stored on the notification queue 370 for the message segment, form received parameters which specify the item identifier..."; also see col.14, lines 8-10, "Preferably, the reassembling process will use a data repository such as a file...". The file can be considered a certain type of documented information.).

Claim 2:

Baber further discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising detecting the user message identifier in a unit of the computer system where a majority of user message identifiers can be detected (see for example, Fig.6, "RQ" and related,

also see col.13, lines 64-66, "receiving queue mechanism 360").

Claim 3:

Baber further discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising recording a second user message identifier used by a second program in presenting a second user message, and storing information about the second user message in the log (see for example, Fig.4, and the loop from step 400 to 460 and related text.)

Claim 7:

Baber further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the stored information includes one selected from the group consisting of: the user message identifier, how many messages associated with the user message identifier have been presented, to which user in the computer system the user message was presented, a date when the user message was presented, and combinations thereof (see for example, col.14, lines 14-19, "identifier and priority, and optionally a 'percent complete' indication, and the file name...").

Claim 8:

Baber further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the stored information comprises a text of the presented user message. (see for example, col.14, lines 14-19, "identifier and priority, and optionally a 'percent complete' indication, and

the file name...").

Claim 9:

Baber further discloses the method of claim 8, further comprising determining the text by accessing a storage of message texts (see for example, col.14, lines 5-10, "data repository such as a file on a disk drive").

Claim 10:

Baber further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the stored information comprises one selected from the group consisting of: a sequence number of the presented user message, a name of the program, an event that triggered the program to present the user message, information on where in the computer system the user message was triggered, a system flag status when the message was triggered, and combinations thereof (see for example, col.14, lines 14-19, "identifier and priority, and optionally a 'percent complete' indication, and the file name...")..

Claim 16:

Baber discloses a computer program product (see for example, Abstract, "a method, system and computer-readable code", also see col.6, lines 44-66, "implemented as a computer software program") containing executable instructions that when executed cause a processor to perform operations as in

claim 1 above, which is a software product version of claim 1. Therefore, it is also anticipated by Baber. (see for example, col.20, lines 7- col.21, lines 9)

Claim 21:

Baber further discloses a computer system (see for example Fig.1) that can be used to perform the method in claims 1 and 2 above which is a system version of claims 1 and 2. Therefore, it is also anticipated by Baber. (see for example, col.21, line 10- col.22, line 10)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
11. Claims 4, 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baber (Baber et al., US 6,658,485 B1) in view of Hickson (Hickson et al., US 2003/0033440 A1).

Claim 4:

Baber discloses the method of claim 1, but does not disclose the method further comprising accessing a list that identifies the information about the presented user message that is to be stored in the log. However, Hickson in the same analogous art of method of logging message discloses the method comprising accessing a list that identifies the information about the stored user message (see for example, Fig.4, step 402 and related text, also see paragraphs [0032]-[0033], "hash value"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Hickson's method to find the reference of saved message in the log in Baber's invention. One would have been motivated to do so to find information about saved message efficiently instead of scanning whole log file as Hickson suggested (see for example, paragraph [0032])")

Claim 6:

Baber discloses the method of claim 4, but does not disclose wherein the list specifies that information about a particular user message is not to be stored. However, Hickson in the same analogous art of method of logging message discloses the method comprising accessing a list that identifies the information about the stored user message (see for example, Fig.4, step 402 and related text, also see paragraphs [0032]-[0033], "hash value"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Hickson's method to find the reference of the message that is not

saved in the log in Baber's invention. One would have been motivated to do so to find information about saved message efficiently instead of scanning whole log file as Hickson suggested (see for example, paragraph [0032])"

Claim 17:

Claim 17 is the product version of the method as discussed in claim 4 above. It is well known in the computer art that the computer program product can be executed by a computer to perform method above, Therefore, it is also unpatentable by Baber and Hickson

12. Claims 5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baber (Baber et al., US 6,658,485 B1) in view of Hickson (Hickson et al., US 2003/0033440 A1) and in further view of Lodrigue (Lodrigue et al., US 6,691,175 B1)

Claim 5:

Baber and Hickson disclose the method as in claim 4 above, but do not disclose wherein the information is to be stored in one of at least two logs and one of the logs is a default log, further comprising storing the information in the default log for messages where the list does not specify one of the logs. However, Lodrigue in the same analogous art of method for managing message between software modules discloses the method to store message in one of two queues (see for example, Fig.2, items 202, 204 and related text, "event queue", "data queue").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Lodrigue's method to store the message in different queues. One would have been motivated to do so that a more efficient organization and propagation of data can be achieved as suggested by Lodrigue (see for example, col.3, lines 44-53, "the advantages of the invention")

Claim 18:

Claim 18 is the product version of the method as discussed in claim 5 above. It is well known in the computer art that the computer program product can be executed by a computer to perform method above, Therefore, it is also unpatentable by Baber, Hickson and Lodrigue.

13. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baber (Baber et al., US 6,658,485 B1) in view of Pramanick (Pramanick et al., US 2004/0225465 A1)

Claim 11:

Baber discloses the method of claim 1, but does not explicitly disclose wherein detecting the program presents the user message comprises introducing code in a kernel of an operating system in the computer system, which code when executed monitors messaging information in the kernel. However, Pramanick in the same analogous art of method for detecting the user message identifier by using message handler in OS kernel (see for example code, p.9, paragraph

[0018], “void CtestPlan MsgHandler::handleGetName()”, “l\_destId=senderId”, “l\_senderId=m\_Id” and related text). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use code in kernel IO library to detect user message identifier. One would have been motivated to do so to enable a user to develop application specific classes for controlling site controllers in hosting operating system as suggested by Pramanick. (see for example, p.2, paragraphs [0023]-0027])

Claim 12:

Baber and Pramanick disclose the method of claim 11, Baber further discloses wherein the messaging information comprises at least one message statement generated by the program (see for example, Fig.7, step 710 and related text, “0 percent complete” message).

Claim 13:

Baber and Pramanick disclose the method of claim 11, Baber further discloses wherein the stored information comprises information from a call stack in the kernel (see for example, col.13, line 64- col.14, line 26, “The item identifier and priority, as well as the data content of this segment, are extracted from the message.”)

Claim 14:

Baber further discloses the method of claim 1, but does not further disclose detecting the user message identifier in a message handler of the computer system. However, Pramanick in the same analogous art of method for detecting the user message identifier by using message handler (see for example, Fig.6, item 604 and related text, also see p.7, paragraph [0096]-[0097], "handlerMessage()", "FunctionTestMsgHandler 604", "message id"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use message handler to detect message identifier in Baber's invention. One would have been motivated to do so to provide a convenient programming module for application development as Pramanick pointed out at page 7, paragraph [0093].

Claim 15:

Baber and Pramanick further disclose the method of claim 14, wherein the user message identifier is detected by monitoring events in the message handler. However, Pramanick in the same analogous art of method for detecting the user message identifier by checking the incoming message in message handler (see for example, p.9-10, paragraph [0118], "if (m\_pTestPlan->getName(testName) != NULL)", "long l-senderId=m\_Id"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to monitor event (message condition) in message handler to detect message identifier in Baber's invention. One would have been motivated to do so that the message

handler can be able to handle error control.

Claims 19 and 20:

Claims 19 and 20 are the product version of the method as discussed in claim 11 and 14 above respectively. It is well known in the computer art that the computer program product can be executed by a computer to perform method above, Therefore, they are also unpatentable by Baber and Pramanick

Claims 22 and 23:

Claims 22 and 23 claim the computer system that can be used to execute the method as discussed in claims 11, 14 and 15 above respectively. It is well known in the computer art that the method above can be practiced, executed and performed in such computer system. Therefore, they are also unpatentable by Baber and Pramanick

***Conclusion***

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims rejection have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zheng Wei whose telephone number is (571) 270-1059 and Fax number is (571) 270-02059. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00-15:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2192

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571- 272-1000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ZW



TUAN DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER